



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,906	07/25/2003	Ralph Reynolds	CU-3258 VE	2422
26530	7590	07/05/2005	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604			JULES, FRANTZ F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3617	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/626,906		REYNOLDS ET AL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Frantz F. Jules		3617	

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 6-7 in the reply filed on 05/02/2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that claims 1-7 are similar. This is not found persuasive because claims 1-5 are drawn to the structure of a tire while claims 6-7 are drawn to a rim which is searched in different areas.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 1-5 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 05/02/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Corner et al (US 4,351,382).

Corner et al disclose a wheel rim for a vehicle, said rim having a circumferential well with a based and a pair of upstanding sidewalls, a pair of lateral extensions projecting from respective ones of said sidewalls to a pair of bead support surfaces (5, 6), each of said bead support surfaces being frustoconical with an included angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees since a bead seat in range of 10 to 20 degrees is disclosed in col 5, lines

Art Unit: 3617

23-25, said bead support surfaces terminating at laterally outer edges in upstanding flanges directed to an opposite side of said lateral extensions to said well.

5. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muhlhoff et al (US 5,749,982).

Muhlhoff et al disclose a wheel rim for a vehicle, said rim having a circumferential well with a based and a pair of upstanding sidewalls, a pair of lateral extensions projecting from respective ones of said sidewalls to a pair of bead support surfaces (23', 23''), each of said bead support surfaces being frustoconical with an included angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees since a bead seat in range of 10 to 45 degrees is disclosed in col 4, lines 23-25, said bead support surfaces terminating at laterally outer edges in upstanding flanges directed to an opposite side of said lateral extensions to said well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diernaz (US 5,232,032).

Diernaz teaches all the limitations of claims 6-8 except for a wheel rim comprising a bead seat having angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees. The general concept of providing a bead seat having angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees to a wheel structure is well known in the art as illustrated by Diernaz which discloses in fig. 1C the teaching

Art Unit: 3617

of a wheel comprising a bead seat (80) having angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees, see col. 6, lines 11-14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Diarnez to include the use of a rim comprising a bead seat having angle in the range of 20 to 24 degrees in his advantageous wheel rim in order to eliminate the use of a protector thereby reducing the use of damage of the bead.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Walther is cited to show related wheel comprising an bead seat having an angle of 20 degrees.

Comer et al and Bradley are cited to show related wheel comprising bead seat with 15 degrees angle.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 272-6681. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz F. Jules
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3617

FFJ

June 28, 2005

FRANTZ F. JULES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Frantz', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.